

Exhibit D - Declaration of Jeanne Finegan

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

**In re POLYURETHANE FOAM
ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

MDL Docket No. 2196

Index No. 10-MD-2196 (JZ)

**DECLARATION OF JEANNE C. FINEGAN, APR, CONCERNING
PROPOSED CLASS MEMBER NOTIFICATION PROGRAM**

I, JEANNE C. FINEGAN declare as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. I am a Senior Vice President of The Garden City Group, Inc. (“GCG”) and of GCG Communications. This Declaration is based upon my personal knowledge, as well as on information provided to me by Plaintiffs’ counsel, my associates and staff and including information reasonably relied upon in the fields of advertising, media and communications.

2. GCG was engaged by the Parties to develop and implement a proposed legal notice program (the “Notice Program”) to notify members of the proposed Settlement Classes that Plaintiffs have entered a proposed Settlement with Defendants Vitafoam, Inc. and Vitafoam Products Canada Limited (collectively “Vitafoam”), and a proposed Settlement with Defendants Domfoam, Domfoam International Inc. and Valle Foam Industries (1995) Inc. (the “Corporate Domfoam Defendants”), along with potential defendants A-Z Sponge & Foam Products Ltd., Bruce Bradley, Dean Brayannis, Michael Cappuccino, Peter Foti, Duke Greenstein, John Howard, Dale McNeill, James William Sproule, Robert Rochietti-Valle, Tony Vallecoccia, and Fred Zickmantel (together with Corporate Domfoam Defendants, the “Domfoam Parties”). The Notice describes, among other things, the terms of the Settlements, and notifies members of the

proposed Settlement Classes that there will be a Final Approval Hearing for the Court to determine whether to approve the Settlements and the proposed Settlement Classes.

As more fully described below, the proposed plan will provide Notice of the Settlement to members of the proposed Settlement Classes. In the Vitafoam Settlement, the Settlement Class is defined to include:

“[A]ll Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs that purchased flexible polyurethane foam in the United States directly from a Defendant or Co-conspirator from January 1, 1999 to August 2010. Excluded from the Settlement Class are 1) defendants and co-conspirators and their respective parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates and 2) any Direct Purchaser who timely elects to be excluded from this settlement.”

In the Domfoam Settlement, the Settlement Class is defined to include:

“[A]ll persons who purchased polyurethane foam in the United States directly from the Defendants in the Action and/or an Alleged Co-Conspirator at any time from January 1, 1999 through the present (defined as the “Class Period”). As will be reflected in the class notices approved by the Court, excluded from the Class are the Voluntary Dismissal Defendants and their representatives, parents, subsidiaries and affiliates, and any of their officers, directors, or employees, and the Non-Settling Defendants and their representatives, parents, subsidiaries and affiliates, and any of their officers, directors, or employees. Also excluded from the Class are all federal, state, and local governmental entities, any judge, justice or judicial officer presiding over this matter and the members of their immediate families and judicial staffs.”

3. This Declaration describes and details the proposed Notice Program and why it is the most appropriate and practicable under the circumstances.

QUALIFICATIONS

4. For the convenience of the Court, I will summarize my credentials that qualify me to provide expert opinions on class action notice programs. I have served as a notice expert, directly responsible for the design and implementation of hundreds of class action notice programs, some of which are the largest and most complex programs ever filed in both the United States and in Canada. I have particularly relevant experience for court approved antitrust matters including:

- *In re Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation*, No. 2006-MDL-1775 (E.D.N.Y.)
- *In re: Pre-Filled Propane Tank Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL Docket No. 2086 (W.D. Mo.), Master Case No. 4:09-md-02086
- *Microsoft Antitrust Litigation Settlement* (multiple states): *In re: Florida Microsoft Antitrust Litigation Settlement*, No. 1999-27340 (Miami-Dade Co., 11th Dist., FL); *In re: Montana Microsoft Antitrust Litig. Settlement*, No. 2000-219 (Lewis & Clark Co., 1st Dist., MT); *In re: North Carolina Microsoft Antitrust Litig. Settlement*, Nos. 2000-4073, 2000-1246 (Wake and Lincoln Cos., Sup. Ct., NC); *In re: Kansas Microsoft Antitrust Litig. Settlement*, No. 1999-C-17089 (Johnson Co., Div. 15, Dist. Ct.)
- *In re: Lorazepam & Clorazepate Antitrust Litig.*, No. 1999-MDL-1290 (D.D.C.)

5. I have more than 20 years of communications and advertising experience and I am the only Notice Expert accredited in Public Relations (APR) by the Universal Accreditation Board, a program administered by the Public Relations Society of America. Further, I have provided testimony before Congress on issues of notice. Also, I have lectured, published and been cited extensively on various aspects of legal noticing, product recall and crisis communications and have served the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) as an expert to determine ways in which the Commission can increase the effectiveness of its product recall campaigns.

6. Additionally, GCG was established in January 1984 to administer settlements of class actions, mass tort litigations, SEC and FTC disgorgement actions, bankruptcies, and other major litigations. GCG has a considerable amount of experience in class action administration and the development of notice programs. In its over 25 years, our team has served as administrator for over 2,500 cases. In the course of our history, GCG has mailed over 287 million notices, disseminated over 700 million emails, handled over 28 million phone calls, processed over 50 million claims, and distributed over \$33 billion in benefits. GCG's legal notices have appeared in more than 40 languages in approximately 170 countries.

7. A comprehensive description of my credentials and experience is attached as Exhibit A.

PROPOSED NOTICE PROGRAM AND CONSIDERATIONS

8. Based on my experience with similar antitrust matters, it is my opinion that the most appropriate method of dissemination of notice to the Class in this action is by individual mailed notice directly to all customers of all Defendants and known Co-Conspirators in this case. Further, this notice effort would be supplemented with publication of a summary notice in leading trade journals¹. Moreover, it is our intention to evaluate the sufficiency and deliverability of the customer lists, based on returned mail statistics, and if warranted, the Notice Program will be further enhanced and expanded to include publication of the summary Notice in general media forums such as *The Wall Street Journal*, as well as Internet banner advertising on highly targeted web sites, so that the targeted audience of Class Members is sufficiently reached. The proposed direct-mail method of notice dissemination conforms to the highest standards of individual notice - and it is reasonable to undertake here. Further, it is an approach which has been accepted in notable Court Approved cases including *In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation*, No. 2006-MDL-1775 (E.D.N.Y.) and *Mayo v. Walmart Stores and Sam's Club*, No. 5:06 CV-93-R (W.D. Ky).

9. Unlike certain class action settlements, in this proposed Settlement, it is reasonable to assume that the identities of a majority of the Settlement Class Members have been captured and maintained during the normal course of business by the Defendant companies and known Co-Conspirator companies. Therefore, in my opinion, the most practicable and targeted notice program in this case would be to obtain customer lists from all Defendants and known Co-Conspirators. In that way, the total universe of purchasers of flexible polyurethane foam will be known, and as a result GCG will be able to calculate the estimated total number of Class Members reached through the direct mail effort. Through this approach, and using tools and

¹ Trade and specialty publications selected for this program will appropriately target the broad range of industries directly purchasing flexible polyurethane foam including: flooring (carpeting and textiles), bedding, furniture and transportation. The leading trade industry titles include among others: *Furniture Today*, *Automotive News*, and *Floor Covering News*.

methods accepted in the advertising and communications industry, we will be able to provide a statistical report for the Court regarding the percentage of Class Members reached in this case. In modern notice programs it is common practice to estimate the percentage of a target audience reached through a combination of direct mail, and as necessary, notice by publication. In order to calculate the effectiveness of the direct mail outreach, a total universe of potentially affected Class Members must be established. By obtaining customer information from all Defendants, establishing a universe of affected Class Members and the percentage of these Class Members reached by the Notice Program is achievable. Direct Notice to Class Members after obtaining the direct mail data from Defendants is the most reasonable option to providing surety to the Court that a Due Process Notice program has been implemented. Absent the establishment of a known Class Member universe, a more robust media program will need to be employed. Direct mail when available has always been the preferred method of outreach by U.S. Courts. The alternative to this highly efficient outreach is to provide an expensive, less-targeted, broad-reaching Notice Program through generally circulated media.

10. Our preferred Notice Program requires access to customer records of Vitafoam and Domfoam, as well as all Defendants and known Co-Conspirators. Defendants' and Co-Conspirators disclosing said information would permit GCG to develop a database of Settlement Class Members' last known addresses, and to utilize this database to send notice directly to those addresses by U.S. First-Class Mail. Using the proposed Notice Program, it is reasonable to assume that the overwhelming majority of Class Members will receive this direct mail notice.

11. Plaintiffs' counsel has asked Vitafoam and Domfoam to provide, and they have agreed in the Settlements to voluntarily provide, their customers' contact information. I understand that Plaintiffs' counsel have requested this information from each of the non-settling Defendants. I understand Plaintiffs are asking the Court for its assistance in obtaining the non-settling Defendants' and Co-Conspirators' customer lists².

² In Notice programs today, outreach programs not employing reasonable efforts are drawing increasingly greater Court scrutiny. (See, e.g., *Larson v. Sprint Nextel Corp.*, Civil Action No. 07-5325 (JLL) slip op. at 6, 9, 26 (D.

12. This is a similar approach to the Notice Program approved in *In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litig.*, No. 06-MD-1775, 2009 WL 3077396 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 25, 2009). In *Air Cargo*, one defendant settled, and GCG served as claims administrator to provide notice of the settlement to customers of all defendants. The court presumed that customers' contact information could be reasonably obtained from all defendants, and ordered each non-settling defendant to provide that information unless it could make a showing that disclosure was too burdensome. 2009 WL 3077396, at *3.

13. The Court may include a confidentiality provision in its order directing the Defendants and Co-Conspirators to provide their customer contact information only to GCG. GCG routinely obtains sensitive and confidential information while administering settlements, and, of course, will abide by any Court orders regarding the handling of such information.

14. It is generally accepted that a Due Process Notice Program should reach at least 70 percent of all Class Members. Depending on the sufficiency and deliverability of the customer lists resulting from the direct mail campaign, GCG may recommend supplementing the direct mail and trade publication program as necessary in online and general media, once it has had the opportunity to evaluate the reach of the Direct Notice Program.

15. As noted above, subject to GCG's analysis of the data, and consistent with a best practicable effort, GCG may recommend also publishing notice in general media including *Newsweek Magazine* and *The Wall Street Journal* as well as appropriate Internet banner advertising on targeted web properties such as *FoxNews.com*, *CNN.com*, and the *24/7 Network*, comprised of more than 4,000 websites including over 30 business-to-business industrial manufacturing websites. Additionally the Notice Program may be expanded to include the *City Biz Network*, which includes more than 200 local business websites including 40 top local business journal newspaper websites throughout the United States.

16. By utilizing the compilation of Defendants' and Co-Conspirators' customer data, to mail directly to Defendant and Co-Conspirator customers, along with the steps GCG will

N.J., April 30, 2009) - declining to preliminarily approve settlement where notice program did not provide for individual notice to Class Members who could be [reasonably] identified and ordering parties to provide individual notice to identifiable Class Members.

employ to insure the most updated address information, the Direct Notice Program is estimated to be able to reach an overwhelming majority of Class Members. Upon completion of the Direct Notice Program, GCG will complete an analysis of the direct mail effort and further report to the Court on the percentage of Class Members reached by this Notice effort. As is customary for all our cases, GCG will employ best efforts to ensure the highest degree of deliverability. The specific results will be reported to the Court at the end of the Notice Program.

17. In the event customer data is not provided by all Defendants and Co-Conspirators, a much broader and expensive publication program will need to be implemented to appropriately reach Class Members. This approach would not be preferable to directly noticing Class Members.

PRESS RELEASE

18. A neutral press release will be distributed to PR Newswire's English and Hispanic newswires. A US1 newswire distributes to thousands of media outlets, including newspapers, magazines, national wire services, television and radio broadcast media, web sites, Internet networks and social networking media in all 50 states. The Hispanic newswire reaches hundreds of media outlets nationally. PR Newswire is a world-recognized newswire with a wire, Internet, satellite and fax network that is capable of the immediate distribution of news releases to the media, financial community and consumers.

OFFICIAL SETTLEMENT WEBSITE

19. Importantly, the Notice Program includes an official website. On this website Class Members may obtain further information about the class action, their rights, dates and deadlines and related information. The website address will be prominently displayed in the summary notice, and also in the long form Notice mailed to Class Members. Important court documents, the claim form and long form Notice will all be available for downloading, in addition to other information. The website established and maintained by GCG will be accessible 24-hours a day, 7-days a week.

TOLL-FREE TELEPHONE

20. GCG will maintain a toll-free telephone line where callers may obtain information and have questions answered about the proposed class action. The telephone number will be prominently displayed in the direct mail and the summary Notice, as well as on the website.

CONCLUSION

21. This method of focused notice dissemination is the most reasonable and targeted approach to effectuating Due Process Notice in this case. By obtaining the customer data from all Defendants and known Co-Conspirators for a comprehensive direct mail notice program, GCG will be able to establish the universe of Class Members, directly notice those Class Members, analyze the results of the Direct Notice campaign, and then identify whether additional media is needed. This Notice Program allows for the expansion of its media component as needed to reach at least 70 percent of targeted audience, ensures the highest standard of individual notice to Class Members, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and in my opinion, will more than adequately satisfy due process and the rules governing class actions.

22. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

23. Executed this 21st day of May, 2012 at Lake Oswego, Oregon.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeanne C. Finegan", with a stylized flourish at the end.

JEANNE C. FINEGAN

Exhibit A

Jeanne C. Finegan, APR

Biography

JEANNE C. FINEGAN, APR

BIOGRAPHY

Jeanne Finegan is Senior Vice President of The Garden City Group, Inc. (“GCG”), and GCG Communications, a division of GCG. She has more than 20 years of communications and advertising experience and is a distinguished legal notice and communications expert. Ms. Finegan is accredited in Public Relations (APR) by the Universal Accreditation Board, which is a program administered by the Public Relations Society of America. She is also recognized by the Canadian Public Relations Society.

Ms. Finegan has provided expert testimony before Congress on issues of notice, and expert testimony in both state and federal courts regarding notification campaigns. She has also conducted media audits of proposed notice programs to assess their adequacy under Fed R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2) and similar state class action statutes. Ms. Finegan is also recognized as a legal notice expert by Canadian courts.

Ms. Finegan has lectured, published and has been cited extensively on various aspects of legal noticing, product recall and crisis communications and has served the Consumer Product Safety Commission as an expert to determine ways in which the Commission can increase the effectiveness of its product recall campaigns.

Further setting the legal notice standard, Ms. Finegan has been the first legal notice expert to integrate new media and social media into court approved legal notice programs. Additionally she was one of the first notice experts to write legal notices in “plain language” as noted by a RAND study.¹ Ms. Finegan has also developed and implemented many of the nation’s largest and most high profile legal notice communication and advertising programs. In the course of her class action experience, courts have recognized the merits of, and admitted expert testimony based on, her scientific evaluation of the effectiveness of notice plans. She has designed legal notices for a wide range of class actions and consumer matters that include product liability, construction defect, anti-trust, medical/pharmaceutical, human rights, civil rights, telecommunication, media, environment, government enforcement actions, securities, banking, insurance, mass tort, restructuring and product recall.

JUDICIAL COMMENTS AND LEGAL NOTICE CASES

In evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of Ms. Finegan’s notice campaigns, courts have repeatedly recognized Ms. Finegan’s excellent work. The following excerpts provide some examples of such judicial approval.

Stern v. AT&T Mobility Wireless, No. 09-cv-1112 CAS-AGR (C.D.Cal.). In the Final Approval Order, the Honorable Christina A. Snyder stated:

[T]he Court finds that the Parties have fully and adequately effectuated the Notice Plan, as required by the Preliminary Approval Order, and, in fact, have achieved better results than anticipated or required by the Preliminary Approval Order.

DeHoyos, et al. v. Allstate Ins. Co., No. SA-01-CA-1010 (W.D.Tx.). In the Amended Final Order and Judgment Approving Class Action Settlement, the Honorable Fred Biery stated:

[T]he undisputed evidence shows the notice program in this case was developed and implemented by a nationally recognized expert in class action notice programs. ... This

¹ Deborah R. Hensler et al., CLASS ACTION DILEMMAS, PURSUING PUBLIC GOALS FOR PRIVATE GAIN. RAND (2000).

program was vigorous and specifically structured to reach the African-American and Hispanic class members. Additionally, the program was based on a scientific methodology which is used throughout the advertising industry and which has been routinely embraced routinely [sic] by the Courts. Specifically, in order to reach the identified targets directly and efficiently, the notice program utilized a multi-layered approach which included national magazines; magazines specifically appropriate to the targeted audiences; and newspapers in both English and Spanish.

Stefanyshyn v. Consolidated Industries, No. 79 D 01-9712-CT-59 (Tippecanoe County Sup. Ct., Ind.). In the Order Granting Final Approval of Settlement, Judge Randy Williams stated:

The long and short form notices provided a neutral, informative, and clear explanation of the Settlement. ... The proposed notice program was properly designed, recommended, and implemented ... and constitutes the "best practicable" notice of the proposed Settlement. The form and content of the notice program satisfied all applicable legal requirements. ... The comprehensive class notice educated Settlement Class members about the defects in Consolidated furnaces and warned them that the continued use of their furnaces created a risk of fire and/or carbon monoxide. This alone provided substantial value.

McGee v. Continental Tire North America, Inc. et al, No. 06-6234-(GEB) (D.N.J.).

The Class Notice, the Summary Settlement Notice, the web site, the toll-free telephone number, and all other notices in the Agreement, and the notice methodology implemented pursuant to the Agreement: (a) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (b) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action, the terms of the settlement and their rights under the settlement, including, but not limited to, their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed settlement and to appear at the Fairness Hearing; (c) were reasonable and constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notification; and (d) met all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1715, and the Due Process Clause(s) of the United States Constitution, as well as complied with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

In re: Reebok Easytone Litigation, No. 10-CV-11977 (D. MA.). The Honorable F. Dennis Saylor IV stated in the Final Approval Order:

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Class Notice, the publication of the Summary Settlement Notice, the establishment of a website containing settlement-related materials, the establishment of a toll-free telephone number, and all other notice methods set forth in the Settlement Agreement and [Ms. Finegan's] Declaration and the notice dissemination methodology implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and this Court's Preliminary Approval Order... constituted the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances of the Actions.

Varacallo, et al. v. Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company, et al., No. 04-2702 (JLL) (D.N.J.). The Court stated that:

[A]ll of the notices are written in simple terminology, are readily understandable by Class Members, and comply with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices. ... By working with a nationally syndicated media research firm, [Finegan's firm] was able to define a target audience for the MassMutual Class Members, which provided a valid basis for determining the magazine and newspaper preferences of the Class Members. (Preliminary

Approval Order at p. 9). . . . The Court agrees with Class Counsel that this was more than adequate. (Id. at § 5.2).

In re: Nortel Network Corp., Sec. Litig., No. 01-CV-1855 (RMB) Master File No. 05 MD 1659 (LAP) (S.D.N.Y.). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented the extensive United States and Canadian notice programs in this case. The Canadian program was published in both French and English, and targeted virtually all investors of stock in Canada. See www.nortelsecuritieslitigation.com. Of the U.S. notice program, the Honorable Loretta A. Preska stated:

The form and method of notifying the U.S. Global Class of the pendency of the action as a class action and of the terms and conditions of the proposed Settlement ... constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.

Regarding the B.C. Canadian Notice effort: *Jeffrey v. Nortel Networks*, [2007] BCSC 69 at para. 50, the Honourable Mr. Justice Groberman said:

The efforts to give notice to potential class members in this case have been thorough. There has been a broad media campaign to publicize the proposed settlement and the court processes. There has also been a direct mail campaign directed at probable investors. I am advised that over 1.2 million claim packages were mailed to persons around the world. In addition, packages have been available through the worldwide web site nortelsecuritieslitigation.com on the Internet. Toll-free telephone lines have been set up, and it appears that class counsel and the Claims Administrator have received innumerable calls from potential class members. In short, all reasonable efforts have been made to ensure that potential members of the class have had notice of the proposal and a reasonable opportunity was provided for class members to register their objections, or seek exclusion from the settlement.

Mayo v. Walmart Stores and Sam's Club, No. 5:06 CV-93-R (W.D.Ky.). In the Order Granting Final Approval of Settlement, Judge Thomas B. Russell stated:

According to defendants' database, the Notice was estimated to have reached over 90% of the Settlement Class Members through direct mail. The Settlement Administrator ... has classified the parties' database as 'one of the most reliable and comprehensive databases [she] has worked with for the purposes of legal notice.'... The Court thus reaffirms its findings and conclusions in the Preliminary Approval Order that the form of the Notice and manner of giving notice satisfy the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and affords due process to the Settlement Class Members.

Lucas, et al. v. Kmart Corp., No. 99-cv-01923 (D.Colo.), wherein the Court recognized Jeanne Finegan as an expert in the design of notice programs, and stated:

The Court finds that the efforts of the parties and the proposed Claims Administrator in this respect go above and beyond the "reasonable efforts" required for identifying individual class members under F.R.C.P. 23(c)(2)(B).

In re: Johns-Manville Corp. (Statutory Direct Action Settlement, Common Law Direct Action and Hawaii Settlement), No. 82-11656, 57, 660, 661, 665-73, 75 and 76 (BRL) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.). The nearly half-billion dollar settlement incorporated three separate notification programs, which targeted all persons who had asbestos claims whether asserted or unasserted, against the Travelers Indemnity Company. In the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of a Clarifying Order Approving the Settlements, slip op. at 47-48 (Aug. 17, 2004), the Honorable Burton R. Lifland, Chief Justice, stated:

As demonstrated by Findings of Fact (citation omitted), the Statutory Direct Action Settlement notice program was reasonably calculated under all circumstances to apprise the affected individuals of the proceedings and actions taken involving their interests, Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950), such program did apprise the overwhelming majority of potentially affected claimants and far exceeded the minimum notice required. . . . The results simply speak for themselves.

Pigford v. Glickman and U.S. Department of Agriculture, No. 97-1978. 98-1693 (PLF) (D.D.C.). This matter was the largest civil rights case to settle in the United States in over 40 years. The highly publicized, nationwide paid media program was designed to alert all present and past African-American farmers of the opportunity to recover monetary damages against the U.S. Department of Agriculture for alleged loan discrimination. In his Opinion, the Honorable Paul L. Friedman commended the parties with respect to the notice program, stating;

The parties also exerted extraordinary efforts to reach class members through a massive advertising campaign in general and African American targeted publications and television stations. . . . The Court concludes that class members have received more than adequate notice and have had sufficient opportunity to be heard on the fairness of the proposed Consent Decree.

In re: Louisiana-Pacific Inner-Seal Siding Litig., Nos. 879-JE, and 1453-JE (D.Or.). Under the terms of the Settlement, three separate notice programs were to be implemented at three-year intervals over a period of six years. In the first notice campaign, Ms. Finegan implemented the print advertising and Internet components of the Notice program. In approving the legal notice communication plan, the Honorable Robert E. Jones stated:

The notice given to the members of the Class fully and accurately informed the Class members of all material elements of the settlement...[through] a broad and extensive multi-media notice campaign.

Additionally, with regard to the third-year notice program for Louisiana-Pacific, the Honorable Richard Unis, Special Master, commented that the notice was:

...well formulated to conform to the definition set by the court as adequate and reasonable notice. Indeed, I believe the record should also reflect the Court's appreciation to Ms. Finegan for all the work she's done, ensuring that noticing was done correctly and professionally, while paying careful attention to overall costs. Her understanding of various notice requirements under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, helped to insure that the notice given in this case was consistent with the highest standards of compliance with Rule 23(d)(2).

In re: Expedia Hotel Taxes and Fees Litigation, No. 05-2-02060-1 (SEA) (Sup. Ct. of Wash. in and for King County). In the Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, Judge Monica Benton stated:

The Notice of the Settlement given to the Class ... was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. All of these forms of Notice directed Class Members to a Settlement Website providing key Settlement documents including instructions on how Class Members could exclude themselves from the Class, and how they could object to or comment upon the Settlement. The Notice provided due and adequate notice of these proceeding and of the matters set forth in the Agreement to all persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of CR 23 and due process.

Rene Rosales v. Fortune Ins. Co., No. 99-04588 CA (41) (11th Judicial Dist. Ct. of Miami-Dade County, Fla.). Ms. Finegan provided expert testimony in this matter. She conducted an audit on behalf of

intervening attorneys for the proposed notification to individuals insured with personal injury insurance. Based upon the audit, Ms. Finegan testified that the proposed notice program was inadequate. The Court agreed and signed an Order Granting Intervenors' Objections to Class Action Settlement, stating:

The Court finds that Ms. Finegan is qualified as an expert on class notice and effective media campaigns. The Court finds that her testimony is credible and reliable.

Thomas A. Foster and Linda E. Foster v. ABTco Siding Litigation, No. 95-151-M (Cir. Ct., Choctaw County, Ala.). This litigation focused on past and present owners of structures sided with Abitibi-Price siding. The notice program that Ms. Finegan designed and implemented was national in scope and received the following praise from the Honorable J. Lee McPhearson:

The Court finds that the Notice Program conducted by the Parties provided individual notice to all known Class Members and all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable efforts and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances of this Action. This finding is based on the overwhelming evidence of the adequacy of the notice program. ... The media campaign involved broad national notice through television and print media, regional and local newspapers, and the Internet (see id. ¶¶9-11) The result: over 90 percent of Abitibi and ABTco owners are estimated to have been reached by the direct media and direct mail campaign.

Wilson v. Massachusetts Mut. Life Ins. Co., No. D-101-CV 98-02814 (First Judicial Dist. Ct., County of Santa Fe, N.M.). This was a nationwide notification program that included all persons in the United States who owned, or had owned, a life or disability insurance policy with Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company and had paid additional charges when paying their premium on an installment basis. The class was estimated to exceed 1.6 million individuals. www.insuranceclassclaims.com. In granting preliminary approval to the settlement, the Honorable Art Encinias found:

[T]he Notice Plan [is] the best practicable notice that is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances of the action. ...[and] meets or exceeds all applicable requirements of the law, including Rule 1-023(C)(2) and (3) and 1-023(E), NMRA 2001, and the requirements of federal and/or state constitutional due process and any other applicable law.

Sparks v. AT&T Corp., No. 96-LM-983 (Third Judicial Cir., Madison County, Ill.). The litigation concerned all persons in the United States who leased certain AT&T telephones during the 1980's. Ms. Finegan designed and implemented a nationwide media program designed to target all persons who may have leased telephones during this time period, a class that included a large percentage of the entire population of the United States. In granting final approval to the settlement, the Court found:

The Court further finds that the notice of the proposed settlement was sufficient and furnished Class Members with the information they needed to evaluate whether to participate in or opt out of the proposed settlement. The Court therefore concludes that the notice of the proposed settlement met all requirements required by law, including all Constitutional requirements.

In re: Georgia-Pacific Toxic Explosion Litig., No. 98 CVC05-3535 (Ct. of Common Pleas, Franklin County, Ohio). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented a regional notice program that included network affiliate television, radio and newspaper. The notice was designed to alert adults living near a Georgia-Pacific plant that they had been exposed to an air-born toxic plume and their rights under the terms of the class action settlement. In the Order and Judgment finally approving the settlement, the Honorable Jennifer L. Bunner stated:

[N]otice of the settlement to the Class was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort.

The Court finds that such effort exceeded even reasonable effort and that the Notice complies with the requirements of Civ. R. 23(C).

In re: American Cyanamid, No. CV-97-0581-BH-M (S.D.Al.). The media program targeted Farmers who had purchased crop protection chemicals manufactured by American Cyanamid. In the Final Order and Judgment, the Honorable Charles R. Butler Jr. wrote:

The Court finds that the form and method of notice used to notify the Temporary Settlement Class of the Settlement satisfied the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and due process, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice to all potential members of the Temporary Class Settlement.

In re: First Alert Smoke Alarm Litig., No. CV-98-C-1546-W (UWC) (N.D.Al.). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented a nationwide legal notice and public information program. The public information program ran over a two-year period to inform those with smoke alarms of the performance characteristics between photoelectric and ionization detection. The media program included network and cable television, magazine and specialty trade publications. In the Findings and Order Preliminarily Certifying the Class for Settlement Purposes, Preliminarily Approving Class Settlement, Appointing Class Counsel, Directing Issuance of Notice to the Class, and Scheduling a Fairness Hearing, the Honorable C.W. Clemon wrote that the notice plan:

...constitutes due, adequate and sufficient notice to all Class Members; and (v) meets or exceeds all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), the Alabama State Constitution, the Rules of the Court, and any other applicable law.

In re: James Hardie Roofing Litig., No. 00-2-17945-65SEA (Sup. Ct. of Wash., King County). The nationwide legal notice program included advertising on television, in print and on the Internet. The program was designed to reach all persons who own any structure with JHBP roofing products. In the Final Order and Judgment, the Honorable Steven Scott stated:

The notice program required by the Preliminary Order has been fully carried out... [and was] extensive. The notice provided fully and accurately informed the Class Members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and their opportunity to participate in or be excluded from it; was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; was valid, due and sufficient notice to all Class Members; and complied fully with Civ. R. 23, the United States Constitution, due process, and other applicable law.

Barden v. Hurd Millwork Co. Inc., et al, No. 2:6-cv-00046 (LA) (E.D.Wis.) ("*The Court approves, as to form and content, the notice plan and finds that such notice is the best practicable under the circumstances under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B) and constitutes notice in a reasonable manner under Rule 23(e)(1).*")

Altieri v. Reebok, No. 4:10-cv-11977 (FDS) (D.C.Mass.) ("*The Court finds that the notices ... constitute the best practicable notice..... The Court further finds that all of the notices are written in simple terminology, are readily understandable by Class Members, and comply with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.*")

Marenco v. Visa Inc., No. CV 10-08022 (DMG) (C.D.Cal.) ("*[T]he Court finds that the notice plan...meets the requirements of due process, California law, and other applicable precedent. The Court finds that the proposed notice program is designed to provide the Class with the best notice practicable, under the circumstances of this action, of the pendency of this litigation and of the proposed Settlement's terms, conditions, and procedures, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice*

to all persons entitled thereto under California law, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law.")

Palmer v. Sprint Solutions, Inc., No. 09-cv-01211 (JLR) (W.D.Wa.) ("*The means of notice were reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to be provide3d with notice.*")

In re: Tyson Foods, Inc., Chicken Raised Without Antibiotics Consumer Litigation, No. 1:08-md-01982 RDB (D. Md. N. Div.) ("*The notice, in form, method, and content, fully complied with the requirements of Rule 23 and due process, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice of the settlement.*")

Sager v. Inamed Corp. and McGhan Medical Breast Implant Litigation, No. 01043771 (Sup. Ct. Cal., County of Santa Barbara) ("*Notice provided was the best practicable under the circumstances.*").

Deke, et al. v. Cardservice Internat'l, Case No. BC 271679, slip op. at 3 (Sup. Ct. Cal., County of Los Angeles) ("*The Class Notice satisfied the requirements of California Rules of Court 1856 and 1859 and due process and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances.*").

Levine, et al. v. Dr. Philip C. McGraw, et al., Case No. BC 312830 (Los Angeles County Super. Ct., Cal.) ("*[T]he plan for notice to the Settlement Class ... constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice to the members of the Settlement Class ... and satisfies the requirements of California law and federal due process of law.*").

In re: Canadian Air Cargo Shipping Class Actions, Court File No. 50389CP, Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Supreme Court of British Columbia, Quebec Superior Court ("*I am satisfied the proposed form of notice meets the requirements of s. 17(6) of the CPA and the proposed method of notice is appropriate.*").

Fischer et al v. IG Investment Management, Ltd. et al, Court File No. 06-CV-307599CP, Ontario Superior Court of Justice.

In re: Vivendi Universal, S.A. Securities Litigation, No. 02-cv-5571 (RJH)(HBP) (S.D.N.Y.).

In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation, No. 06-MD-1775 (JG) (VV) (E.D.N.Y.).

Berger, et al., v. Property ID Corporation, et al., No. CV 05-5373-GHK (CWx) (C.D.Cal.).

Hartless v. Clorox Company, No. 06-CV-2705 (CAB) (S.D.Cal.).

Lozano v. AT&T Mobility Wireless, No. 02-cv-0090 CAS (AJWx) (C.D.Cal.).

In re: Processed Egg Products Antitrust Litigation, MDL 08-md-02002 (E.D.Pa.).

Howard A. Engle, M.D., et al., v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Philip Morris, Inc., Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., No. 94-08273 CA (22) (11th Judicial Dist. Ct. of Miami-Dade County, Fla.).

In re: Royal Dutch/Shell Transport Securities Litigation, No. 04 Civ. 374 (JAP) (Consolidated Cases) (D. N.J.).

In re: Epson Cartridge Cases, Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding, No. 4347 (Sup. Ct. of Cal., County of Los Angeles).

UAW v. General Motors Corporation, No: 05-73991 (E.D.MI).

Wicon, Inc. v. Cardservice Intern'l, Inc., BC 320215 (Sup. Ct. of Cal., County of Los Angeles).

In re: SmithKline Beecham Clinical Billing Litig., No. CV. No. 97-L-1230 (Third Judicial Cir., Madison County, Ill.). Ms. Finegan designed and developed a national media and Internet site notification program in connection with the settlement of a nationwide class action concerning billings for clinical laboratory testing services.

MacGregor v. Schering-Plough Corp., No. EC248041 (Sup. Ct. Cal., County of Los Angeles). This nationwide notification program was designed to reach all persons who had purchased or used an aerosol inhaler manufactured by Schering-Plough. Because no mailing list was available, notice was accomplished entirely through the media program.

In re: Swiss Banks Holocaust Victim Asset Litig., No. CV-96-4849 (E.D.N.Y.). Ms. Finegan managed the design and implementation of the Internet site on this historic case. The site was developed in 21 native languages. It is a highly secure data gathering tool and information hub, central to the global outreach program of Holocaust survivors. www.swissbankclaims.com.

In re: Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Litig., No. A89-095-CV (HRH) (Consolidated) (D. Alaska). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented two media campaigns to notify native Alaskan residents, trade workers, fisherman, and others impacted by the oil spill of the litigation and their rights under the settlement terms.

In re: Johns-Manville Phenolic Foam Litig., No. CV 96-10069 (D. Mass). The nationwide multi-media legal notice program was designed to reach all Persons who owned any structure, including an industrial building, commercial building, school, condominium, apartment house, home, garage or other type of structure located in the United States or its territories, in which Johns-Manville PFRI was installed, in whole or in part, on top of a metal roof deck.

Bristow v Fleetwood Enters Litig., No Civ 00-0082-S-EJL (D. Id). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented a legal notice campaign targeting present and former employees of Fleetwood Enterprises, Inc., or its subsidiaries who worked as hourly production workers at Fleetwood's housing, travel trailer, or motor home manufacturing plants. The comprehensive notice campaign included print, radio and television advertising.

In re: New Orleans Tank Car Leakage Fire Litig., No 87-16374 (Civil Dist. Ct., Parish of Orleans, LA) (2000). This case resulted in one of the largest settlements in U.S. history. This campaign consisted of a media relations and paid advertising program to notify individuals of their rights under the terms of the settlement.

Garria Spencer v. Shell Oil Co., No. CV 94-074(Dist. Ct., Harris County, Tex.). The nationwide notification program was designed to reach individuals who owned real property or structures in the United States which contained polybutylene plumbing with acetyl insert or metal insert fittings.

In re: Hurd Millwork Heat Mirror™ Litig., No. CV-772488 (Sup. Ct. of Cal., County of Santa Clara). This nationwide multi-media notice program was designed to reach class members with failed heat mirror seals on windows and doors, and alert them as to the actions that they needed to take to receive enhanced warranties or window and door replacement.

Laborers Dist. Counsel of Alabama Health and Welfare Fund v. Clinical Lab. Servs., Inc, No. CV-97-C-629-W (N.D. Ala.). Ms. Finegan designed and developed a national media and Internet site notification program in connection with the settlement of a nationwide class action concerning alleged billing discrepancies for clinical laboratory testing services.

In re: StarLink Corn Prods. Liab. Litig., No. 01-C-1181 (N.D. Ill.). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented a nationwide notification program designed to alert potential class members of the terms of the settlement.

In re: MCI Non-Subscriber RatePayers Litig., MDL Docket No. 1275, 3:99-cv-01275 (S.D.Ill.). The advertising and media notice program, found to be “more than adequate” by the Court, was designed with the understanding that the litigation affected all persons or entities who were customers of record for telephone lines presubscribed to MCI/World Com, and were charged the higher non-subscriber rates and surcharges for direct-dialed long distance calls placed on those lines. www.rateclaims.com.

In re: Albertson’s Back Pay Litig., No. 97-0159-S-BLW (D.Id.). Ms. Finegan designed and developed a secure Internet site, where claimants could seek case information confidentially.

In re: Georgia Pacific Hardboard Siding Recovering Program, No. CV-95-3330-RG (Cir. Ct., Mobile County, Ala.). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented a multi-media legal notice program, which was designed to reach class members with failed G-P siding and alert them of the pending matter. Notice was provided through advertisements which aired on national cable networks, magazines of nationwide distribution, local newspaper, press releases and trade magazines.

In re: Diet Drugs (Phentermine, Fenfluramine, Dexfenfluramine) Prods. Liab. Litig., Nos. 1203, 99-20593. Ms. Finegan worked as a consultant to the National Diet Drug Settlement Committee on notification issues. The resulting notice program was described and complimented at length in the Court’s Memorandum and Pretrial Order 1415, approving the settlement,

In re: Diet Drugs (Phentermine, Fenfluramine, Dexfenfluramine) Prods. Liab. Litig., 2000 WL 1222042, Nos. 1203, 99-20593 (E.D.Pa. Aug. 28, 2002).

Ms. Finegan designed the Notice programs for multiple state antitrust cases filed against the Microsoft Corporation. In those cases, it was generally alleged that Microsoft unlawfully used anticompetitive means to maintain a monopoly in markets for certain software, and that as a result, it overcharged consumers who licensed its MS-DOS, Windows, Word, Excel and Office software. The multiple legal notice programs designed by Jeanne Finegan and listed below targeted both individual users and business users of this software. The scientifically designed notice programs took into consideration both media usage habits and demographic characteristics of the targeted class members.

In re: Florida Microsoft Antitrust Litig. Settlement, No. 99-27340 CA 11 (11th Judicial Dist. Ct. of Miami-Dade County, Fla.).

In re: Montana Microsoft Antitrust Litig. Settlement, No. DCV 2000 219 (First Judicial Dist. Ct., Lewis & Clark Co., Mt.).

In re: South Dakota Microsoft Antitrust Litig. Settlement, No. 00-235(Sixth Judicial Cir., County of Hughes, S.D.).

In re: Kansas Microsoft Antitrust Litig. Settlement, No. 99C17089 Division No. 15 Consolidated Cases (Dist. Ct., Johnson County, Kan.) (“The Class Notice provided was the best notice practicable under the circumstances and fully complied in all respects with the requirements of due process and of the Kansas State. Annot. §60-22.3.”).

In re: North Carolina Microsoft Antitrust Litig. Settlement, No. 00-CvS-4073 (Wake) 00-CvS-1246 (Lincoln) (General Court of Justice Sup. Ct., Wake and Lincoln Counties, N.C.).

In re: ABS II Pipes Litig., No. 3126 (Sup. Ct. of Cal., Contra Costa County). The Court approved regional notification program designed to alert those individuals who owned structures with the pipe that they were eligible to recover the cost of replacing the pipe.

In re: Avenue A Inc. Internet Privacy Litig., No: C00-1964C (W.D. Wash.).

In re: Lorazepam and Clorazepate Antitrust Litig., No. 1290 (TFH) (D.C.C.).

In re: Providian Fin. Corp. ERISA Litig., No C-01-5027 (N.D. Cal.).

In re: H & R Block., et al Tax Refund Litig., No. 97195023/CC4111 (Maryland Cir. Ct., Baltimore City).

In re: American Premier Underwriters, Inc, U.S. Railroad Vest Corp., No. 06C01-9912 (Cir. Ct., Boone County, Ind.).

In re: Sprint Corp. Optical Fiber Litig., No: 9907 CV 284 (Dist. Ct., Leavenworth County, Kan).

In re: Shelter Mutual Ins. Co. Litig., No. CJ-2002-263 (Dist.Ct., Canadian County. Ok).

In re: Conseco, Inc. Sec. Litig., No: IP-00-0585-C Y/S CA (S.D. Ind.).

In re: Nat'l Treasury Employees Union, et al., 54 Fed. Cl. 791 (2002).

In re: City of Miami Parking Litig., Nos. 99-21456 CA-10, 99-23765 – CA-10 (11th Judicial Dist. Ct. of Miami-Dade County, Fla.).

In re: Prime Co. Incorporated D/B/A/ Prime Co. Personal Comm., No. L 1:01CV658 (E.D. Tx.).

Alsea Veneer v. State of Oregon A.A., No. 88C-11289-88C-11300.

SEC ENFORCEMENT NOTICE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

SEC v. Vivendi Universal, S.A., et al., Case No. 02 Civ. 5571 (RJH) (HBP) (S.D.N.Y.).

GCG was engaged by a distribution agent, who was appointed by the SEC to perform the Notice and administration work related to the settlement. The Notice program included publication in 11 different countries and eight different languages. The engagement involved a full range of services, from design and printing of the notice and claim packets through claims processing, and ultimately distribution.

SEC v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Company, No.04-3359 (S.D. Tex.)

SEC v. Zurich Financial Services, No. 08 Civ. 10760 (S.D. N.Y.)

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION NOTICE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

FTC v. Reebok International Ltd., No. 11-cv-02046 (N.D. Ohio)

FTC v. Chanery and RTC Research and Development LLC [Nutraquest], No :05-cv-03460 (D.N.J.)

BANKRUPTCY EXPERIENCE

Ms. Finegan has designed and implemented hundreds of domestic and international bankruptcy notice programs. A sample case list includes the following:

In re AMR Corporation [American Airlines], et al., No. 11-15463 (SHL) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.) ("*due and proper notice [was] provided, and ... no other or further notice need be provided.*")

In re Jackson Hewitt Tax Service Inc., et al., No 11-11587 (Bankr. D.Del.) (2011). The debtors sought to provide notice of their filing as well as the hearing to approve their disclosure statement and confirm their plan to a large group of current and former customers, many of whom current and viable addresses promised to be a difficult (if not impossible) and costly undertaking. The court approved a publication notice program designed and implemented by Finegan and GCG, that included more than 350 local newspaper and television websites, two national online networks (24/7 Real Media, Inc. and Microsoft Media Network), a website notice linked to a press release and notice on eight major websites, including CNN and Yahoo. These online efforts supplemented the print publication and direct-mail notice provided to known claimants and their attorneys, as well as to the state attorneys general of all 50 states. The *Jackson Hewitt* notice program constituted one of the first large chapter 11 cases to incorporate online advertising.

In re: Nutraquest Inc., No. 03-44147 (Bankr. D.N.J.)

In re: General Motors Corp. et al, No. 09-50026 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.). This case is the 4th largest bankruptcy in U.S. history. Ms. Finegan and her team worked with General Motors restructuring attorneys to design and implement the legal notice program.

In re: ACandS, Inc., No. 0212687 (Bankr. D.Del.) (2007) ("*Adequate notice of the Motion and of the hearing on the Motion was given.*").

In re: United Airlines, No. 02-B-48191 (Bankr. N.D Ill.). Ms. Finegan worked with United and its restructuring attorneys to design and implement global legal notice programs. The notice was published in 11 countries and translated into 6 languages. Ms. Finegan worked closely with legal counsel and UAL's advertising team to select the appropriate media and to negotiate the most favorable advertising rates. www.pd-ual.com.

In re: Enron, No. 01-16034 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.). Ms. Finegan worked with Enron and its restructuring attorneys to publish various legal notices.

In re: Dow Corning, No. 95-20512 (Bankr. E.D. Mich.). Ms. Finegan originally designed the information website. This Internet site is a major information hub that has various forms in 15 languages.

In re: Harnischfeger Inds., No. 99-2171 (RJW) Jointly Administered (Bankr. D. Del.). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented 6 domestic and international notice programs for this case. The notice was translated into 14 different languages and published in 16 countries.

In re: Keene Corp., No. 93B 46090 (SMB), (Bankr. E.D. MO.). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented multiple domestic bankruptcy notice programs including notice on the plan of reorganization directed to all creditors and all Class 4 asbestos-related claimants and counsel.

In re: Lamonts, No. 00-00045 (Bankr. W.D. Wash.). Ms. Finegan designed an implemented multiple bankruptcy notice programs.

In re: Monet Group Holdings, Nos. 00-1936 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del.). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented a bar date notice.

In re: Laclede Steel Co., No. 98-53121-399 (Bankr. E.D. MO.). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented multiple bankruptcy notice programs.

In re: Columbia Gas Transmission Corp., No. 91-804 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.). Ms. Finegan developed multiple nationwide legal notice notification programs for this case.

In re: U.S.H. Corp. of New York, et al. (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.). Ms. Finegan designed and implemented a bar date advertising notification campaign.

In re: Best Prods. Co., Inc., No. 96-35267-T, (Bankr. E.D. Va.). Ms. Finegan implemented a national legal notice program that included multiple advertising campaigns for notice of sale, bar date, disclosure and plan confirmation.

In re: Lodgian, Inc., et al., No. 16345 (BRL) Factory Card Outlet – 99-685 (JCA), 99-686 (JCA) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.).

In re: Internat'l Total Servs, Inc., et al., Nos. 01-21812, 01-21818, 01-21820, 01-21882, 01-21824, 01-21826, 01-21827 (CD) Under Case No: 01-21812 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y.).

In re: Decora Inds., Inc. and Decora, Incorp., Nos. 00-4459 and 00-4460 (JJF) (Bankr. D. Del.).

In re: Genesis Health Ventures, Inc., et al., No. 002692 (PJW) (Bankr. D. Del.).

In re: Tel. Warehouse, Inc., et al., No. 00-2105 through 00-2110 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del.).

In re: United Cos. Fin. Corp., et al., No. 99-450 (MFW) through 99-461 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del.).

In re: Caldor, Inc. New York, The Caldor Corp., Caldor, Inc. CT, et al., No. 95-B44080 (JLG) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.).

In re: Physicians Health Corp., et al., No. 00-4482 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del.).

In re: GC Cos., et al., Nos. 00-3897 through 00-3927 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del.).

In re: Heilig-Meyers Co., et al., Nos. 00-34533 through 00-34538 (Bankr. E.D. Va.).

PRODUCT RECALL AND CRISIS COMMUNICATION EXPERIENCE

Reser's Fine Foods. Reser's is a nationally distributed brand and manufacturer of food products through giants such as Albertsons, Costco, Food Lion, WinnDixie, Ingles, Safeway and Walmart. Ms. Finegan designed an enterprise-wide crisis communication plan that included communications objectives, crisis team roles and responsibilities, crisis response procedures, regulatory protocols, definitions of incidents that require various levels of notice, target audiences, and threat assessment protocols. Ms. Finegan worked with the company through two nationwide, high profile recalls, conducting extensive media relations efforts.

Gulf Coast Claims Facility Notice Campaign. Finegan coordinated a massive outreach effort throughout the Gulf Coast region to notify those who have claims as a result of damages caused by the Deep Water Horizon Oil spill. The notice campaign includes extensive advertising in newspapers throughout the region, Internet notice through local newspaper, television and radio websites and media relations. The

Gulf Coast Claims Facility (GCCF) is an independent claims facility, funded by BP, for the resolution of claims by individuals and businesses for damages incurred as a result of the oil discharges due to the Deepwater Horizon incident on April 20, 2010.

City of New Orleans Tax Revisions, Post-Hurricane Katrina. In 2007, the City of New Orleans revised property tax assessments for property owners. As part of this process, it received numerous appeals to the assessments. GCG served as liaison between the city and property owners, coordinating the hearing schedule and providing important information to property owners on the status of their appeal. Central to this effort was the comprehensive outreach program designed by Ms. Finegan, which included a website and a heavy schedule of television, radio and newspaper advertising, along with the coordination of key news interviews about the project picked up by local media.

ARTICLES

Co-Author, "New Media Creates New Expectations for Bankruptcy Notice Programs," ABI Journal, Vol. XXX, No 9, November 2011.

Quoted Expert, "Effective Class Action Notice Promotes Access to Justice: Insight from a New U.S. Federal Judicial Center Checklist," Canadian Supreme Court Law Review, (2011), 53 S.C.L.R. (2d).

Co-Author, with Hon. Dickran Tevrizian – "Expert Opinion: It's More Than Just a Report...Why Qualified Legal Experts Are Needed to Navigate the Changing Media Landscape," BNA Class Action Litigation Report, 12 CLASS 464, 5/27/11.

Co-Author, with Hon. Dickran Tevrizian, Your Insight, "Expert Opinion: It's More Than Just a Report - Why Qualified Legal Experts Are Needed to Navigate the Changing Media Landscape," TXLR, Vol. 26, No. 21, 5/26/2011.

Quoted Expert, "Analysis of the FJC's 2010 Judges' Class Action Notice and Claims Process Checklist and Guide: A New Roadmap to Adequate Notice and Beyond," BNA Class Action Litigation Report, 12 CLASS 165, 2/25/11.

Author, Five Key Considerations for a Successful International Notice Program, BNA Class Action Litigation Report, 4/9/10 Vol. 11, No. 7 p. 343.

Quoted Expert, "Communication Technology Trends Pose Novel Notification Issues for Class Litigators," BNA Electronic Commerce and Law, 15 ECLR 109 1/27/2010.

Author, "Legal Notice: R U ready 2 adapt?" BNA Class Action Report, Vol. 10 Class 702, 7/24/2009.

Author, "On Demand Media Could Change the Future of Best Practicable Notice," BNA Class Action Litigation Report, Vol. 9, No. 7, 4/11/2008, pp. 307-310.

Quoted Expert, "Warranty Conference: Globalization of Warranty and Legal Aspects of Extended Warranty," Warranty Week, warrantyweek.com/archive/ww20070228.html/ February 28, 2007.

Co-Author, "Approaches to Notice in State Court Class Actions," For The Defense, Vol. 45, No. 11, November, 2003.

Citation, "Recall Effectiveness Research: A Review and Summary of the Literature on Consumer Motivation and Behavior," U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC-F-02-1391, p.10, Heiden Associates, July 2003.

Author, "The Web Offers Near, Real-Time Cost Efficient Notice," American Bankruptcy Institute, ABI Journal, Vol. XXII, No. 5., 2003.

Author, "Determining Adequate Notice in Rule 23 Actions," For The Defense, Vol. 44, No. 9 September, 2002.

Author, "Legal Notice, What You Need To Know and Why," Monograph, July 2002.

Co-Author, "The Electronic Nature of Legal Noticing," The American Bankruptcy Institute Journal, Vol. XXI, No. 3, April 2002.

Author, "Three Important Mantras for CEO's and Risk Managers," - International Risk Management Institute, irmi.com, January 2002.

Co-Author, "Used the Bat Signal Lately," The National Law Journal, Special Litigation Section, February 19, 2001.

Author, "How Much is Enough Notice," Dispute Resolution Alert, Vol. 1, No. 6. March 2001.

Author, "Monitoring the Internet Buzz," The Risk Report, Vol. XXIII, No. 5, Jan. 2001.

Author, "High-Profile Product Recalls Need More Than the Bat Signal," - International Risk Management Institute, irmi.com, July 2001.

Co-Author, "Do You Know What 100 Million People are Buzzing About Today?" Risk and Insurance Management, March 2001.

Quoted Article, "Keep Up with Class Action," Kentucky Courier Journal, March 13, 2000.

Author, "The Great Debate - How Much is Enough Legal Notice?" American Bar Association – Class Actions and Derivatives Suits Newsletter, winter edition 1999.

SPEAKER/EXPERT PANELIST/PRESENTER

Law Seminars International	Speaker, "Class Action Notice: Rules and Statutes Governing FRCP (b)(3) Best Practicable... What constitutes a best practicable notice? What practitioners and courts should expect in the new era of online and social media." Chicago, IL, October 2011. <i>*Voted by attendees as one of the best presentations given.</i>
CASD 4 th Annual	Faculty Panelist, "Reasonable Notice - Insight for practitioners on the FJC's <i>Judges' Class Action Notice and Claims Process Checklist and Plain Language Guide</i> . Consumer Attorneys of San Diego Class Action Symposium, San Diego, California, October 2011.
CLE International	Faculty Panelist, Building a Workable Settlement Structure, CLE International, San Francisco, California May, 2011.
Consumer Attorneys of San Diego (CASD)	Faculty Panelist, "21 st Century Class Notice and Outreach." 3 rd Annual Class Action Symposium CASD Symposium, San Diego, California,

October 2010.

Consumer Attorneys of San Diego (CASD)	Faculty Panelist, "The Future of Notice." 2 nd Annual Class Action Symposium CASD Symposium, San Diego California, October 2009.
American Bar Association	<p>Speaker, 2008 Annual Meeting, "Practical Advice for Class Action Settlements: The Future of Notice In the United States and Internationally – Meeting the Best Practicable Standard."</p> <p>Section of Business Law Business and Corporate Litigation Committee – Class and Derivative Actions Subcommittee, New York, NY, August 2008.</p>
Women Lawyers Association of Los Angeles	Faculty Panelist, Women Lawyers Association of Los Angeles (WLALA) CLE Presentation, "The Anatomy of a Class Action." Los Angeles, CA, February, 2008.
Warranty Chain Management	Faculty Panelist, Presentation Product Recall Simulation. Tampa, Florida, March 2007.
Practicing Law Institute (PLI)	Faculty Panelist, CLE Presentation, 11 th Annual Consumer Financial Services Litigation. Presentation: Class Action Settlement Structures – Evolving Notice Standards in the Internet Age. New York/Boston (simulcast), NY March 2006; Chicago, IL April 2006 and San Francisco, CA, May 2006.
U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission	Ms. Finegan participated as an expert panelist to the Consumer Product Safety Commission to discuss ways in which the CPSC could enhance and measure the recall process. As a panelist, Ms Finegan discussed how the CPSC could better motivate consumers to take action on recalls and how companies could scientifically measure and defend their outreach efforts. Bethesda MD, September 2003.
Weil, Gotshal & Manges	Presenter, CLE presentation, "A Scientific Approach to Legal Notice Communication." New York, June 2003.
Sidley & Austin	Presenter, CLE presentation, "A Scientific Approach to Legal Notice Communication." Los Angeles, May 2003.
Kirkland & Ellis	Speaker to restructuring group addressing "The Best Practicable Methods to Give Notice in a Tort Bankruptcy." Chicago, April 2002.
Georgetown University Law Center Mass Tort Litigation Institute	Faculty, CLE White Paper: "What are the best practicable methods to give notice? Dispelling the communications myth – A notice disseminated is a notice communicated," Mass Tort Litigation Institute. Washington D.C., November, 2001.
American Bar Association	Presenter, "How to Bullet-Proof Notice Programs and What Communication Barriers Present Due Process Concerns in Legal Notice," ABA Litigation Section Committee on Class Actions & Derivative Suits. Chicago, IL, August 6, 2001.
McCutchin, Doyle, Brown	Speaker to litigation group in San Francisco and simulcast to four other

& Enerson	McCutchin locations, addressing the definition of effective notice and barriers to communication that affect due process in legal notice. San Francisco, CA, June 2001.
Marylhurst University	Guest lecturer on public relations research methods. Portland, OR, February 2001.
University of Oregon	Guest speaker to MBA candidates on quantitative and qualitative research for marketing and communications programs. Portland, OR, May 2001.
Judicial Arbitration & Mediation Services (JAMS)	Speaker on the definition of effective notice. San Francisco and Los Angeles, CA, June 2000.
International Risk Management Institute	Past Expert Commentator on Crisis and Litigation Communications. www.irmi.com .
The American Bankruptcy Institute Journal (ABI)	Past Contributing Editor – Beyond the Quill. www.abi.org .

BACKGROUND

Prior to joining The Garden City Group, Inc., Ms. Finegan co-founded Huntington Advertising, a nationally recognized leader in legal notice communications. After Fleet Bank purchased her firm in 1997, she grew the company into one of the nation's leading legal notice communication agencies.

Prior to that, Ms. Finegan spearheaded Huntington Communications, (an Internet development company) and The Huntington Group, Inc., (a public relations firm). As a partner and consultant, she has worked on a wide variety of client marketing, research, advertising, public relations and Internet programs. During her tenure at the Huntington Group, client projects included advertising (media planning and buying), shareholder meetings, direct mail, public relations (planning, financial communications) and community outreach programs. Her past client list includes large public and privately held companies: Code-A-Phone Corp., Thrifty-Payless Drug Stores, Hyster-Yale, The Portland Winter Hawks Hockey Team, U.S. National Bank, U.S. Trust Company, Morley Capital Management, and Durametal Corporation.

Prior to Huntington Advertising, Ms. Finegan worked as a consultant and public relations specialist for a West Coast-based Management and Public Relations Consulting firm.

Additionally, Ms. Finegan has experience in news and public affairs. Her professional background includes being a reporter, anchor and public affairs director for KWJJ/KJIB radio in Portland, Oregon, as well as reporter covering state government for KBZY radio in Salem, Oregon. Ms. Finegan worked as an assistant television program/promotion manager for KPDX directing \$50 million in programming. She was also the program/promotion manager at and KECH-22 television.

Ms. Finegan's multi-level communication background gives her a thorough, hands-on understanding of media, the communication process, and how it relates to creating effective and efficient legal notice campaigns.

MEMBERSHIPS AND PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

APR - The Universal Board of Accreditation Public Relations Society of America – Accredited.

Member of the Public Relations Society of America

Member Canadian Public Relations Society

Also see *LinkedIn* page.